

To whom it may concern,

I am uncertain if anyone will read this as there is presently an incredibly large volume of comments being put forth to the FCC as regards the classification of broadband services. Despite this howling in the wind, I will do my best to put forth an argument for the preservation of the existing regulations that the FCC has established for itself. Here I speak specifically against Chairman Pai's proposal put forth on ending Title II regulation of broadband services.

As the proponents of the deconstruction of existing regulation put forth, regulations impede the progress of industry. This is as near a certain statement as can be made, as regulations do indeed by their very nature prohibit corporations from undertaking certain actions. The point is valid, but it is one that lacks a longer vision than what a governance might have. There are details that this line of argumentation does not give the level of credence that such an argument could; specifically the line of argumentation does not seem to take into account how corporations whose success is dependent upon an open internet might be impacted by the removal of existing regulations (see Title II broadband regulations).

The purpose of Title II is not solely in the interest of the consumer, but also in the interest of industry itself. A competitor for Netflix simply does not have the clout necessary to be able to provide competitive services without the existing Title II regulations in place, nor does any other internet based service that wishes to cast its lot in with its competitors (consider marketplaces to compete with Amazon and craigslist, or e-services for credit unions wishing to offer competitive services established banking conglomerates). Without these regulations, the e-entrepreneurs of the present simply do not have the same even field that is afforded their non-digital counterparts. Consider what happens when a competitive manufacturer is not afforded the same access to rail and trucking services that their established counter parts have; that manufacturer is not terribly likely to succeed.

Given a free enough market this is surely a trivial matter, but a free market the American people do not so readily possess when it comes to broadband services. Many Americans lack the ability to choose a reliable broadband service provider; some only have one provider available to them. This is an issue that is compounded if Title II is not upheld for the long-distance haulers of the digital world, broadband providers such as Level 3 and others who provide bulk digital hauling services to the last-mile providers such as Comcast and Time Warner. Without Title II, these providers, both the long-distance and last-mile, can become fickle creatures and fail to provide consistent services both to each other as corporations and to the ultimate victim, the consumer.

There's a lot of stuff going on in this emerging digital age which pertains to the industries that surround it. There are details that are present that must be considered for reasonable legislation and regulation to be realized. Considerations of the false analogies that are seemingly present in the minds of our establishments of government do not aid the government, its people, or the organizations that arise in our society. It is short sighted to transpose traditional conceptions of the telecoms industry to what we now have emerging, a wholly new and immensely different marketplace. I would entreat the reader, if any such thing might be said to exist, to consider carefully the environment to which their regulations apply before taking action as a governing body.

Thank you for your time,

M David Johnson